

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

**JUL 31 2001**

From the:  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

KULKARNI, Sima, Singadia  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
2400 Monarch Tower  
3424 Peachtree Road, N.E.  
Atlanta, GA 30326  
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

# PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	23.07.2001
-------------------------------------	------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference 01005-0111	<b>REPLY DUE</b> <b>within 2 month(s)</b> from the above date of mailing
---	--

International application No. PCT/US00/26890	International filing date (day/month/year) 29/09/2000	Priority date (day/month/year) 01/10/1999
---	--	--

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61L15/22
--

Applicant ACRYMED et al.
-----------------------------

1. This written opinion is the **first** drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☒ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain document cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

**When?** See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

**Also:** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.  
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.  
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

**If no reply is filed**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 01/02/2002.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:	Authorized officer / Examiner
--	-------------------------------

 European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Economou, D Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits) Almalé Murillo, J-A Telephone No. +49 89 2399 8059
---	--



**I. Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"*):

**Description, pages:**

1-49 as originally filed

**Claims, No.:**

1-20 as originally filed

**Drawings, sheets:**

1/8-8/8 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
- ☐ the claims, Nos.:

☐ the drawings, sheets:

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)):

*(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)*

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

**III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

1. The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been and will not be examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
- ☒ claims Nos. 14-20 (see separate sheet, items 2-3) ,

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 14,17-20 (see separate sheet, items 2-3) are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):  
**see separate sheet**
- ☒ the claims, or said claims Nos. 15-16 (see separate sheet, item 3) are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☐ no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos. .

2. A written opinion cannot be drawn due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:

- ☐ the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.
- ☐ the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.

**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims 1-13 (NO; see separate sheet, item 4)

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

## WRITTEN OPINION

International application No. PCT/US00/26890

---

Industrial applicability (IA)      Claims    1-20 (YES; see separate sheet, item 1).

2. Citations and explanations  
**see separate sheet**

**WRITTEN OPINION  
SEPARATE SHEET**

---

International application No. PCT/US00/26890

- 1). The subject-matter of claims 1-20 fulfils the requirements of industrial applicability.
- 2). The subject-matter of claims 17-20 is unclear since it is not clear how a matrix can be made antimicrobial by merely adding a anion-donating, a cation-donating and a stabilizing solution or how a anion-donating, a cation-donating and a stabilizing solution can form a metal or silver.
- 3). The subject-matter of claim 14 is unclear since neither the stabilizing solution nor the active agent is defined.  
The subject-matter of claims 15 and 16 is not supported by the description since ferric chloride and copper chloride are disclosed solely for the stabilization of ionic silver.
- 4). The subject-matter of claims 1-13 is not novel since it is identically disclosed in **D1** (=WO-A-99/25395; see the whole document, claims and examples).